

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 and 58-73 were pending. Claims 1, 58, 70, and 71 have been amended. No claims have been added/canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-43 and 58-73 remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment.

Claims 1-4, 7, 42, 43, 58, 59, 67 and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by previously cited U.S. Patent No. 6,337,715 (hereinafter “Inagaki”). Claims 5-11, 26-27, and 59-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki in view of Program Guide for Digital Television ATSC Standard (hereinafter “ATSC”). Claim 73 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,133 (hereinafter “Hopkins”). Claims 1-43, 68 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. While Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections, Applicant has nevertheless amended the claims to further clarify the nature of the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the following comments.

For example, claim 1 recites a data processing engine including

a front end configured to receive a broadcast signal including a format definition expressed in a Bachus Naur Form, wherein said format definition comprises a description of a grammar which defines a syntax of a target language; and

a generic data processing engine configured to:

receive said format definition;

receive additional data which conforms to the target language; and

process the additionally received data in accordance with the
format definition.

In view of the above clarifications, the claims are believed readily distinguished from the cited art. For example, none of the cited art discloses or suggests a receiver configured to receive a broadcast signal including a format definition expressed in a Bachus Naur Form, and a generic data processing engine configured to then process additionally received data in accordance with the format definition. As such features are nowhere disclosed or suggested, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited art, taken either singly or in combination. Each of the remaining independent claims are distinguishable for at least these reasons as well. In addition, it is believed the present claim amendments render the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections moot.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5266-09300/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rory D. Rankin /

Rory D. Rankin

Reg. No. 47,884

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: February 16, 2010